

LEG00188

Thelen, Mary Beth (DEQ)

From: The Office of Senator Ananich <SenJAnanich@senate.michigan.gov>
Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2015 12:57 PM
To: Wyant, Dan (DEQ); Pallone, Maggie (DEQ)
Cc: Jordan.Dickinson@mail.house.gov; mayor@cityofflint.com; HCroft@cityofflint.com; hedman.susan@epa.gov; poy.thomas@epa.gov; Schock.michael@epa.gov; Lytle.darren@epa.gov; fortin.denise@epa.gov; Shekter Smith, Liane (DEQ); Cook, Pat (DEQ); Busch, Stephen (DEQ); Wurfel, Brad (DEQ); Edwardsm@vt.edu
Subject: Letter Regarding Water in the City of Flint
Attachments: Flint Water Letter to DEQ 09102015.pdf

Director Wyant,

Please see the attached letter regarding water in the City of Flint. For your convenience, we are also mailing a hard copy of this letter to your office.

Thank you for your prompt consideration of this urgent matter impacting our community.

Sincerely,

Jim Ananich
Senate Democratic Leader
District 27

Sheldon Neeley
State Representative
District 34

Phil Phelps
State Representative
District 49



STATE OF MICHIGAN

September 10, 2015

Michigan Department of Environmental Quality
Executive Division
DEQ Director: Dan Wyant
P.O. Box 30473
Lansing, MI 48909-7973

Director Wyant,

In light of recently released findings by the American Civil Liberties Union, independent researchers and a troubling Interim U.S. Environmental Protection Agency memo from June, we are requesting additional answers about the safety and treatment of the City of Flint's water.

Several disturbing points have been raised and we have a number of urgent questions, including:

- **When did the MDEQ become aware of the June 24, 2015, Interim EPA memo and whom was it shared with?**
 - Which Flint city officials also received this information?
 - Why was the memo not immediately shared with the public?
 - What response did MDEQ have to the EPA concerns raised in the memo?
 - Were any actions taken by the MDEQ as a result of the issues mentioned in the memo?
 - What steps, if any, were taken to determine the validity of the Virginia Tech study?
- **Please explain why the pre-flushing method of sampling was used in this instance.**
 - Is it the same method that is applied to all sampling or does the agency have the discretion to decide?
 - Who is responsible for making the decision to pre-flush?
 - The EPA memo references the Lead Copper Rule requirement that systems greater than 50,000 users maintain "corrosion control treatment." As the regulator, why did the MDEQ choose not to enforce that standard?
 - The EPA recommends allowing water to rest for at least six hours, but no more than 12 hours, before taking a sample. On MDEQ's Web site, it suggests flushing the line for five minutes before the six-hour rest. How did the department arrive at this method?
- **According to a July 9, 2015, article on DeadlineDetroit.com, "Scary: Lead Water and One Flint Family's Toxic Nightmare,"**

"The EPA offered Flint officials the use of agency experts to help get the situation under control," said Del Toral, but added that, to his knowledge, the city has so far declined all help.

LeeAnne Walters said that when she asked why city officials weren't taking the EPA's offer of assistance, she was told, "We don't need it."